

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2001/03/02 : SUAETDP78-04361A000100060011-0

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Chief, Administrative Staff

DATE: 11 February 1954

FROM : Acting Chief, Technical Review Staff

SUBJECT: Management Improvement Staff Recommendations Pertaining to Headquarters Housekeeping Services

25X1A9a

1. As you know, I have had certain misgivings relative to the assignment of responsibility to the Logistics Office for Agency housekeeping services. These misgivings have been expressed orally to you, to Mr. Garrison, to [REDACTED] at various times during the past 6 months. As you will recall, my views in this connection were expressed to you prior to the time I was aware that any consideration was being given to the assignment of General Services Office functions to the Logistics Office. This memorandum is addressed to you because of the responsibility of the Administrative Staff for organizational and staffing control for the Logistics Office.

2. At the outset, I would like to make it clear that my opinions are based upon organization and management principles that I consider to be sound and practical, and upon my own concept of the role the Logistics Office does and should have in the accomplishment of Agency objectives. During the year that I have been with the Agency, I believe developments have clearly demonstrated that the Logistics Office is fast assuming the role of a "G-4" for overall Agency operations. I have noted an increasing awareness of this role in my contacts with non-Logistics Office elements of the Agency. Thus, I feel it to be of paramount importance that the Logistics Office, by its every action, continue to develop its organization and staffing in such manner that Logistics staff and operational responsibilities, in the broadest sense, are emphasized. It is my view that the Logistics Office should specifically resist any assignment of functions that might tend to reduce the emphasis we must place on the accomplishment of our Agency-wide logistics staff and operational missions. It is my opinion that the assignment of headquarters housekeeping services to the Logistics Office does detract from the emphasis we are able to place on what I consider to be our more important responsibilities and that this action definitely is not conducive to increased effectiveness in the logistical support of Agency-wide operations.

3. Through my discussion with Mr. Garrison on this subject several weeks ago, I now understand more clearly some of the underlying reasons for the changes recommended by the Management Improvement Staff. It is unfortunate, I feel, that the actual problems involved could not be handled in a more direct manner; however, this is a matter beyond our control and inasmuch as the decision has been made that the Logistics

Document No. [REDACTED]
No Change in Class. <input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Declassified
Auth.: HR 70-2
Date: 11 Feb 78
016

Approved For Release 2001/03/02 : SUAETDP78-04361A000100060011-0

SECRET

Auth.: HR 70-2
Date: 11 Feb 78

Bws.

~~SECRET~~ CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2001/03/02 : CIA-RDP78-04361A000100060011-0

Office will continue to provide headquarters housekeeping services and will absorb additional functions of this nature, it goes without saying that we must accept these functions willingly, accomplish them in an effective, efficient and economical manner and do so in a way that will result in the least adverse effect upon our other responsibilities.

4. I have reviewed the Management Improvement Staff report with the above thoughts in mind. The report contains certain assumptions and concepts with which I do not agree and I feel that these should be made a matter of record somewhere within our Office, whether or not any action on them is desirable at this time or in the future. I do not intend these remarks to be critical of the Management Improvement Staff or of those who now concur in the report. My only concern is that we "proceed with knowledge". Following are my comments:

a. Paragraph 3 of the report states that ". . . the mere existence of an organizational element of office level carries with it certain overhead expenses" and that "it follows that a considerable savings can be effected whenever it is found to be possible to eliminate such an element . . .". From the presentation in the report, it appears that, based on this assumption, a total of 13 positions (6 of which are at grade levels of GS-11 through GS-16) were determined to be excess through the redistribution of the functions of the General Services Office and were recommended for elimination.

b. In my view, the above assumption is erroneous. The absorption of new functions into an existing organization, even though adequately staffed from an internal functional standpoint, inherently requires the expenditure of manpower in providing necessary supervision and administrative services for the elements absorbed. Housekeeping services are particularly demanding with regard to required supervisory time, a fact that is verified already in our Office by the experience of the Supply Division in connection with operation of headquarters Building Supply Offices and the operation of the headquarters Motor Pool by the Transportation Division. Considering the personnel services that must be provided for the more than 250 additional Logistics Office employees and the supervisory time that must be spent in planning and directing the new functions and in resolving problems and controversial issues raised therein, it is questionable that any net savings in manpower will accrue from the consolidation.

c. Assuming that Logistics Office elements are occupied full time with the accomplishment of currently assigned functions (and the recent reduction of more than 200 positions in the Logistics Office personnel ceiling, already has caused operational hardship), the absorption of these new functions necessarily would appear to require (1) increased staffing to provide overhead services and supervision, or (2) decreased effectiveness in the performance of currently assigned responsibilities.

~~SECRET~~ CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2001/03/02 : CIA-RDP78-04361A000100060011-0

d. Thus, in my view, if the objective of the study is to bring about more economical performance of housekeeping services, it is questionable that this will result. If the objective of the study is to increase efficiency and effectiveness of the services transferred, this result may have been achieved through appropriate changes in personnel in the General Services Office and through recognition and correction of specific deficiencies.

e. In accepting these functions it is believed that the Logistics Office should take the position that, while the overhead positions in the General Services Office are not transferred with the functions at this time, the Logistics Office or the Management Improvement Staff will be responsible for making a restudy of the functions after a period of operation (3 to 6 months) in order to determine actual effect on the Logistics Office staffing requirements and make further adjustments necessary in the Logistics Office T/O.

5. I am aware that the views expressed above very likely are not those which are now most popular in the Logistics Office. Regardless of this, however, I feel that you and Mr. Garrison should expect to receive my objective views on matters referred for comment. Again, I assure you of my complete cooperation in assisting to carry out effectively the decision that has been made.

[Redacted] 25X1A9a

LO/TRS/JAS:ae
cc: Mr. Garrison

(Note: The preceding was dictated prior to reading comments of the Chief and Deputy Chief of the General Services Office pertaining to the O&M Service study; hence, the reactions of that Office did not influence my thinking pertaining to the basic principles and concepts involved.)

I agree that the performance of GSO (Housekeeping) functions represent a deviation from the primary mission of the Logistics Office.
I also agree that our present supervisory strength may be weakened.

25X1A9a